2 The Wisdom of Archilochus

Didactic Intertexts in Early Greek Poetry

LAURA SWIFT

As one of the earliest surviving Greek authors, Archilochus is an especially valuable test-case for how we can understand intertextuality at the start of the Greek literary tradition.[1] His work is filled with allusion to other forms, and adapting these (often to humorous effect) is a hallmark of his style. This is well studied with regard to Archilochus' use of Homeric epic, which has interested readers since antiquity.[2] While modern scholars disagree whether Archilochus knew the texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as they exist today, his poetry's detailed engagement with the motifs, formulae, and vocabulary of early epic establishes beyond doubt that he was deeply familiar with the genre and its conventions.[3] The relationship is one of creative adaptation, and we find Archilochus combining or altering existing formulae to invent something new rather than simply regurgitating Homeric phraseology. Similarly, his erotic poems show awareness of the tropes of love poetry, especially in how he adapts imagery of desire. Generic interaction in Archilochus often draws attention to the gulf between the tone and ethos of the source genre and the world in which the poet and his characters operate. This can create a sense of parody, as for example in the cruel distortion of vegetal imagery usually applied to nubile girls to describe an aged and unattractive woman in fr. 188, or the use of epic language to

[1] The text of Archilochus printed is that of Swift 2019. The numeration of Archilochus fragments follows *IEG*^{2} (= Swift for the fragments discussed here). Translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

[2] For example, a third-century BC papyrus (frr. 219–21: first published by Turner 1955) preserves an anthology of parallel lines of Homer and Archilochus: for discussion see Lavigne 2016. For other ancient interest in comparing Homer and Archilochus, cf. Heracl. Pont. fr. 178 Wehrli *ap.* Diog. Laert. 5.87; [Long.] *De subl.* 13.3; Dio, *Or.* 33.11–12.

[3] For an overview, see Garner 2005: 389–91. A good deal of scholarship on Archilochus and Homer assumes direct textual references, but others are more sceptical, e.g. West 1999, and for a thorough discussion of the broader methodological issues see Kelly 2015c. On Archilochus' stylistic proximity to Homer, see Lulli 2016: 195–9.

criticise uncouth dinner-party behaviour in fr. 124. It can, on the other hand, be used aspirationally, to cast the poet's world in a nobler light, as in several trochaic tetrameters whose epic resonance aggrandises the Parians' experiences in contemporary conflicts (frr. 89, 98).

By contrast, Archilochus' relationship to the Hesiodic tradition has attracted much less attention. Yet, given his close linguistic engagement with early Greek hexameter, and the pervasive role that moralising plays in his poetry, the intersection with wisdom poetry is significant. This chapter will begin by exploring the role that didactic moralising and the wise narrator play in Archilochus' poetry, and what relationship this holds to the wider tradition of wisdom poetry. It will examine instances where his poetry alludes to its tropes, sometimes using it to add gravitas to his own claims, sometimes undermining it for comic effect, and will discuss the methodological issues around claiming a relationship between texts and traditions at this early period.

Having established that Archilochus is familiar with (and expects his audience also to know) the conventions of didactic moralising, I will then attempt to make the case for a stronger proposition, that his poetry engages with a specific textual instantiation, by arguing for a relationship with the poems of Hesiod. I will examine some fragments which demonstrate the best case for an intertextual relationship and discuss how reading these through a Hesiodic lens enhances our understanding of what the poems aim to do and how they fit into Archilochus' broader rhetorical strategy. If we can successfully establish these as intertexts, rather than generic allusions, this has significant consequences for how we should understand the process of canonisation in the Greek world, and the ways in which audiences in a predominantly oral society can engage with intertextuality.

Archilochus the Moralist

Since Archilochus' earliest reception, analysis of his use of traditional morality has been hampered by his reputation as abuse poet *par excellence*. This association was active by the early fifth century BC, as attested by Pindar's description of 'Archilochus the blamer fattening himself on heavy words of hate' (ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν | πιανόμενον, *Pyth.* 2.55–6), which the praise-poet contrasts with his own form of song (52–3). Hermippus, writing in the third century BC, believes that in Gorgias' day the name 'Archilochus' could be a shorthand for 'abuse', and this association became tight in Hellenistic and later scholarship, fuelled by the

shocking biographical stories ascribed to the poet.[4] Simultaneously, the growing interest in categorising poetic forms led literary critics to find in invective a clear way to delineate *iambos* from other genres. The two processes fuelled each other, as beliefs about Archilochus influenced the categorisation of iambus, and the growing assumption that iambus was a genre of blame strengthened its identification with Archilochus. Modern scholarship too has focused on Archilochus as a reprobate who overturned social norms, and discussions of his work tend to give the lion's share to poems that fit that model (e.g. jettisoning his shield in fr. 5, seducing a freeborn maiden in fr. 196a).[5]

Yet this narrow focus clouds Archilochus' diversity of tone and oversimplifies his poetics. In fact, much of his work espouses conventional morality and offers advice couched in high-flown language. Archilochus' moralising ranges from the personal (e.g. fr. 128, on resilience) to the political (e.g. fr. 105, on troubles in Thrace). The Parian cultic tradition offers a corrective to Archilochus' panhellenic reputation as a trouble-maker, and instead depicts the poet as a patriot and divine favourite. The Sosthenes inscription (*IG* XII 5 n. 445 + Suppl. pp. 212–14 Peek 1985 = Clay 2004: 110–18) selects quotations to present an Archilochus who is a wise adviser on moral matters as well as a brave warrior. Even in invective poems, the Archilochean persona often adopts the moral centre-ground to justify his attacks and win sympathy for his cause. Nevertheless, apparently serious advice often proves to have a sting in the tail, as normative beliefs comically fail in a world which falls short of the ideals they express.

It is not hard to find passages that demonstrate Archilochus' awareness of the tropes of didactic literature, or his play on the traditional figure of the wise narrator. A clear example is fr. 25, where the poet sets himself up as the purveyor of moralising *gnōmai*:

] τις ἀνθρώπου φυή,
ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλωι κα⸣ρδίην ἰαίν⸤ε⸣τα⸤ι.
].τ[.].Μελησά[. . .]. σάθη
]ε βουκόλωι Φαλ[. . .]ί̣ωι.
τοῦτ' οὔτις ἄλλ]ος μάντις ἀλλ' ἐγὼ εἶπέ σοι·

[4] Ath. 11.505d–e = Hermippus fr. 63 Wehrli, where Gorgias is said to have responded to Plato's sarcasm with the comment ἦ καλόν γε αἱ Ἀθῆναι [καὶ] *νέον* τοῦτον Ἀρχίλοχον ἐνηνόχασιν ('What a fine new Archilochus Athens has produced'). See Lorenzoni 1995, Rotstein 2010: 298–9.

[5] For the tendency of blame and satire to be treated as hallmarks of poetic style in general, see Rosen 2007: 3.

> Human nature . . . but different people are cheered at heart by different things . . . Melesandros (likes) cock . . . for the cowherd Phalangios. It is (no other prophet) than I who tells you this.

Archilochus opens the poem with a generalising statement about human nature (1) followed by a traditional *gnōmē* to the effect that human taste is varied (2).[6] Yet the persona of the wise adviser is immediately punctured by the *exemplum* he chooses to support this moral: an example of two lower-class characters with differing sexual preferences. Logically, however, the *exemplum* illustrates the point perfectly well; Archilochus does not portray his use of didactic moralising as incompetent but rather applies it to material usually deemed outside its remit, and so playfully tests the boundaries of what can be used to support moralising claims.[7]

A different play on the moralising narrator is found in fr. 14, an address to a companion who will receive counsel from the poet:

> Αἰσιμίδη, δήμου μὲν ἐπίρρησιν μελεδαίνων
> οὐδεὶς ἂν μάλα πόλλ' ἱμερόεντα πάθοι.
>
> Aisimedes, no one will have much fun if he worries about the people's criticism.

While we cannot tell whether the poem as a whole was didactic, the address of generalised moralising to a named individual evokes the traditions of wisdom literature. The advice itself is couched in the form of a universalising *gnōmē*, but is a shocking inversion of social norms,[8] as the adviser counsels Aisimedes to ignore the opinions of others, and to seek pleasure instead. To understand how this relates to traditional wisdom, we need only compare the central role that rebuke plays in Hesiod. Perses is regularly criticised for his failure to abide by moral standards, and the inference is that it is through listening to this criticism that he can develop wisdom. Even high-status individuals, such as the 'gift-eating' kings (βασιλῆας | δωροφάγους, 38–9), can and should be openly rebuked by the narrator. Similarly, in Homeric society, which gives greater prominence than we find in Hesiod to the will and desires of the great individual, heroes are expected to moderate their behaviour when faced with the disapproval of the wider group (*Il.* 6.351, *Od.* 2.136, 14.239, 22.40), while characters who do not care what the community thinks (such as Paris, or Achilles in *Iliad* 9) are criticised by their society.

[6] For the *gnōmē* as traditional, cf. *Od.* 14.228, Sol. fr. 13.43 *IEG*^{2}, Sapph. fr. 16 Voigt, Thgn. 900–1. Markings on the papyrus make it clear that these lines are the beginning of a poem.

[7] For further discussion, see Swift 2017.

[8] *Pace* Page 1964: 136.

We find similar concern expressed over public disapproval at Sappho fr. 5.14 Voigt, where the speaker's anxieties over her brother include the 'accusations of the citizens' (ἐπαγ[ορί]αι πολίταν). Far from the wise adviser imparting age-old norms, Archilochus represents himself as a hedonistic aristocrat who seeks to corrupt others. Aisimedes' name is ironically appropriate, since it can be derived from αἶσα/αἴσιμος, with the meaning 'decent', or 'in moderation'.[9] The Archilochean narrator styles himself as a kind of anti-wise adviser, a figure who corrupts his addressee and leads him from his natural tendencies.

Both fragments thus evoke and parody the conventions of didactic poetry and its rhetoric, which implies a familiarity with these conventions on the part of both poet and audience. By presenting himself as a didactic narrator who either offers advice in an incorrect fashion, or who offers the wrong advice, Archilochus draws the audience's attention to the moral authority normally claimed by such a narrator. Since didactic authority is ultimately awarded by the values and core beliefs of the community, the audience is thus invited to consider whether such a narrator has a right to the status he claims. Thus the audience become active participants in the discourse of didactic authority, rather than simply recipients of the narrator's advice.

It is not hard to demonstrate, then, that Archilochean poetry shows awareness of the didactic tradition, just as it does with heroic epic. This is unsurprising since didactic wisdom is rooted in everyday speech and traditions, which audience members would have encountered in their daily lives as well as within other types of poetry (such as didactic speeches within epic). The examples given above do not prove awareness of any particular didactic poem, but rather of a shared pool of ideas and tropes. Claiming that apparent similarities between texts is indicative of a relationship with the Hesiodic poems specifically is a higher bar to clear. Nevertheless, I believe that we can make a case for direct intertexts in Archilochus' work, and the remainder of this chapter will aim to do exactly that.

Archilochus and Hesiod: Foundations for Intertextuality

In the murky world of early Greek poetry, Archilochus offers two immediate advantages for thinking about intertextuality. First, several factors

[9] See Nicolosi 2013: 106. Aisimedes is attested as a real name (e.g. Paus. 4.5.10, *IG* I^3 1206), but Archilochus is fond of using 'speaking names' with overtones relevant to the poem at hand: see Swift 2019: 38–9.

combine to make him securely dateable.[10] With Hesiod, we are dependent on relative rather than absolute dates.[11] However, most analyses place him around the late eighth or early seventh century, and even the latest possible date range is well before Archilochus.[12] Thus we can say with confidence that it is chronologically plausible that Hesiod's poetry could have been in wider circulation in the Greek world by Archilochus' time. Second, the inscription for Glaucus confirms that the use of writing for commemoration or to preserve knowledge was established in Archilochus' society. A likely reference to writing as a mechanism for transmitting ideas (and possibly poetry) is found in fr. 185, an attack on an individual given the name Kerykides:

> ἐρέω τιν' ὔμιν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη,
> ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη
>
> I will tell you all a fable, O Kerykides, sad message-stick

The poem went on to tell the fable of the Fox and the Monkey, in which a monkey is mocked for his pretentions to be king of the beasts by being tricked by a fox (here as elsewhere, the analogue for the poet himself) and trapped in a compromising position, with his buttocks on display. It is reasonable to infer that Kerykides is mocked for some kind of grandiose or pompous behaviour, and the poem itself is therefore the trap that will expose him for the mere ape that he is. The exact meaning of the phrase 'sad message-stick' is unclear (Aristophanes of Byzantium devoted an entire monograph to the question), but σκυτάλη seems to refer both to the staff carried by a messenger on official business, and to the written message he carried (which, according to Apollonius Rhodius, was wrapped around the staff).[13] Kerykides' name is a play on the word for herald

[10] Nearly all scholars have accepted the dating of Archilochus to the mid-seventh century, since the analysis of Jacoby 1941. For a good overview of the factors involved, see Hall 2002: 236–7.

[11] Cf. Kõiv 2011, who describes Hesiod as a 'floating figure who could have been placed, with or without Homer, at any time between the Ionian migration [i.e. twelfth–tenth century] and the reign of Gyges' (374).

[12] For a good overview of the options for dating Hesiod, and their limitations, see Koning 2018.

[13] For Apollonius, see Ath. 451d. Later authors describe this practice of winding the message as a way of encoding it, so that it could not be read without the staff (Plut. *Lys.* 19, Σ Pind. *Ol.* 6.154, Hesych. σ 1191, though this may be a later embellishment). Whether or not the σκυτάλη was a coded message, references to it make clear that it was a written one, though these admittedly date from the fifth century or later (e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.8–9). West 1988 argues that in Archilochus' day, the σκυτάλη could have been a mnemonic rather than a written text, but there is no evidence that this type of system was ever used by the Greeks, and the motivation to argue against the meaning we know from elsewhere can only be a pre-existing belief that writing cannot have been used in this way in the mid-to-late seventh century.

(κῆρυξ), and the implication is that his fate offers a message to the listener.[14] The imagery indicates an expectation that the story, and hence the poem which conveys it, will circulate to other communities. The choice of a herald implies connectivity and diplomacy between *poleis*, not merely preservation within the community. The message stick itself is of course not a device for transmitting poetry, but the fact that it is used as a metaphor for Archilochus' song is significant, since it invites a connection between writing and song, and hints that both achieve the same end (the circulation of ideas and messages). Archilochus' poem is the message that conveys Kerykides' story and allows the *ainos* to be broadcast to other listeners and communities. The more successful and widely circulated the poem, the more effective Kerykides' punishment, and the herald imagery implies that it ought to travel very far indeed. In other words, Kerykides himself is likened to a (written) message to other Greeks (since what happened to him offers a moral lesson) but this message is dependent on poetry as a vehicle to communicate it. We have reason to argue, then, that Archilochus and his audience would have been familiar both with written texts, and with the circulation of such texts from other parts of the Greek world.

Nevertheless, this was still a society in which oral performance played a significant role, and audience familiarity with poetry would have been predominantly through hearing it performed. For allusion to work effectively, therefore, we must posit not only that the audience had a concept of a relatively fixed text but that they could also recognise references to it through their experience of the work at performances.[15] For understanding the types of references that are likely to function in this context, a valuable concept is that of the 'marquee scene', introduced by Adrian Kelly.[16] By a 'marquee scene', Kelly means a particularly memorable or distinctive scene or moment from a poem. He proposes that, as an intermediary step between reference to shared traditions and detailed textual allusion, an audience could recognise these marquee scenes as belonging to a particular poetic instantiation (for his purposes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as opposed to

[14] Given Archilochus' love for meaningful names, it is likely that Kerykides (like Melesandros, Phalangios, and Aisimides) is a pseudonym made up for the purposes of the poem (see n. 10, and cf. Gallavotti 1949: 138, Gerber 1970: 37), though for a counter-view see Bowie 2008.

[15] See Currie 2016: 18 (though he writes of an earlier period): 'our conception . . . must accommodate some recall of elements of fairly fixed texts, though not necessarily memorization of fully fixed texts'. Conversely, Burgess 2012 explores the possibility of fixed phrases that evoke characters or moments but are not tied to particular textual versions.

[16] See Kelly 2015c and the Introduction to this volume.

the general stock of tales of Troy). For this scenario to be effective, the audience would need to be aware of a specific famous poem and remember its highlights, but achieving this level of familiarity would not require detailed textual knowledge or access to a written copy. As we shall see, the Archilochean passages that offer the strongest case for intertextuality with Hesiod engage with what we might call Hesiodic marquee scenes: particularly vivid or memorable points which stand out from the rest of the poems or come at turning points in the structure and which (to a varying extent) act as self-contained units detachable from the wider narrative. These are the *ainos* of the hawk and nightingale, the story of Pandora as told in the *Theogony*, and advice on seafaring and marriage.

Identifying a Hesiodic scene as memorable simply because it strikes the modern reader as such risks the accusation of importing anachronistic readings and value judgements. One way of tackling this problem is suggested in the work of Hugo Koning, whose monograph on Hesiod opens with two graphs, which he terms 'commemograms', showing which parts of the poetry are most often cited in antiquity, and which are largely ignored.[17] These figures need to be treated with some caution:[18] they cover all of antiquity, only include direct citations as opposed to allusions (which therefore must underestimate the levels of engagement with Hesiod), and the total number of references is small, meaning that we should not read too much statistical significance into particular peaks. Nevertheless, they give us an indication of which parts of the poems were popular later in antiquity and therefore easy to allude to, and these include the passages named above. Recent scholarship has emphasised the likelihood that Hesiod was reperformed piecemeal in antiquity, and this also suggests that individual marquee scenes stood out as self-contained units (while the fact of such performances would have further given these marquee scenes a life of their own).[19] What remains, then, is to examine the intertexts in question and their relationship to the Hesiodic text.

Hesiod and Misogyny I: The First Cologne Epode

As the longest surviving Archilochean fragment, the First Cologne Epode (fr. 196a) offers an obvious starting place to explore the poet's engagement

[17] Koning 2010: 20–1. [18] As noted by Koning 2010: 156 himself.
[19] E.g. Ford 2009, Graziosi 2009, Hunter 2014: 75–86, Canevaro 2015: 8–13, Stamatopolou 2016: 9–12.

with didactic literature. The poem's interaction with *epos* is well recognised: structurally it is modelled on an epic seduction scene, and on a linguistic level it makes rich use of epic formulae.[20] Indeed, the choice of metre maximises the opportunity for allusion to epic, since the hemiepes in the asynartetic line makes it easy for the poet to import hexameter phrases. Yet the metre allows exchange with other forms of hexameter poetry too, and on analysis, a strong didactic tone runs through the poem's two speeches. It can thus fruitfully be read as at least in part a parody of wisdom literature. The length of the Cologne Epode also makes it possible to see how Archilochus evokes Hesiod not through a single definitive quotation, but through a clustering of allusions that attune the audience to his relevance and prime them to notice associations with his poetry. This technique for evoking texts or genre via a critical mass of references is a common feature of generic interaction in oral performance and is an effective way of triggering associations where audiences are capable of grasping allusions but do not have detailed textual memorisation or access to a written copy: we see it regularly, for example, in Attic tragedy's references to other genres, which must be capable of being grasped by audiences watching a play in performance, whether or not they have previously read written texts of the literature evoked.[21] Any individual reference can be explained away by a sceptic as insufficient proof of a relationship, but a critical mass of them starts to point more clearly to a relationship between the two poems. Once the audience is primed to interpret the poem through the lens of Hesiod, aspects of its humour and its invective style come to the fore that are not otherwise apparent. Thus the allusions are not a learned game, but are integral to Archilochus' poetic goals and to how he guides the audience to understand the relationship between the characters.

The poem deals with a sexual encounter between the narrator and a young woman in a rural location. The opening is missing, and the papyrus preserves the second part of the girl's speech (in which she responds to the man's attempt to seduce her), the man's reply, and a narrative section describing the erotic act that takes place afterwards. The girl's speech is usually read as a stage in the negotiations between the couple (he requests

[20] On the poem as a parody of an epic seduction scene, see Henderson 1976: 163–7, Lefkowitz 1976: 186, Swift 2015. On epic language in the poem, see Risch 1975, Campbell 1976.

[21] Discussed in more depth at Swift 2010: 15–17. The relevance of clustering references to evoke an author and associate him with a topic is also discussed by Koning 2010: 151, though using a different type of analysis.

sex, she acknowledges his desire for sex and suggests a substitute), but her words also have a paraenetic quality, and can be fruitfully read in the context of the didactic tradition (1–8):

πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος·
ἶσον δὲ τόλμ[
εἰ δ᾽ ὧν ἐπείγεαι καί σε θυμὸς ἰθύει,
ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου
ἣ νῦν μέγ᾽ ἰμείρε[ι
καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος· δοκέω δέ μι[ν
εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν·
τὴν δὴ σὺ ποίη[σαι φίλην.

Abstaining completely, but bring yourself (?) likewise . . . But if you are in a hurry and your spirit urges you on, there is in our house a girl, young and tender, who greatly desires (you?). I think she has a flawless figure. Make her your girlfriend.

The pattern here, 'hold off from this activity, but if you must do it anyway, I can tell you how to go about it', closely resembles the opening of the Nautilia from *Works and Days*. Here, the narrator begins by advising Perses to suppress his desire to go to sea, and concentrate on farming instead (617–22):[22]

εἰ δέ σε ναυτιλίης δυσπεμφέλου ἵμερος αἱρεῖ·
εὖτ᾽ ἂν Πληιάδες σθένος ὄβριμον Ὠρίωνος
φεύγουσαι πίπτωσιν ἐς ἠεροειδέα πόντον,
δὴ τότε παντοίων ἀνέμων θυίουσιν ἀῆται·
καὶ τότε μηκέτι νῆας ἔχειν ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντωι,
γῆν δ᾽ ἐργάζεσθαι μεμνημένος ὥς σε κελεύω·

But if desire for stormy seafaring takes hold of you: when the Pleiades fall into the cloudy sea, fleeing Orion's mighty strength, it is then that blasts rage from all kinds of winds. At that time, do not keep your boat in the wine-dark sea any longer, but be mindful and work the earth, as I bid you.

Yet immediately after the poet suggests that the farmer's life is preferable to the sailor's, he goes on to offer detailed advice about how to store a ship (624–30), how to relaunch it in the spring (630–2), and how to maximise

[22] Conversely, Phoenix in his speech to Achilles (*Il.* 9.434-8) begins with an εἰ-clause expressing the idea that Achilles' spirit is set on a particular course of action (distasteful to the speaker) but avoids directly offering any alternative advice at this point, instead just concluding that he does not wish to be left behind. Thus we find a similar structural pattern, but adapted in a different rhetorical direction.

profit from a trading journey (641–5). He then suggests once more that there are alternatives to seafaring, reiterating the claim that it is a foolish option, before concluding with the paradox that he is not qualified to offer advice on the subject that he is about to teach (646–9):

> εὖτ' ἂν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην τρέψας ἀεσίφρονα θυμὸν
> βούληαι χρέα τε προφυγεῖν καὶ λιμὸν ἀτερπέα,
> δείξω δή τοι μέτρα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης,
> οὔτε τι ναυτιλίης σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν.
>
> If you turn your witless spirit to trade, and you decide to flee debt and starvation, I will show you the measures of the resounding sea, though I have no skill in seafaring or ships.

There are clear parallels with the Archilochean girl's speech. Both speakers combine a suggestion that their addressee should give up what they are seeking with an acknowledgement that desire may prevent them from doing so. Both suggest (with some reluctance) a modified approach: in Hesiod's case, a cautious approach to seafaring that is mindful of the proper seasons; in the girl's case, sex with a more suitable woman. These parallels in isolation would not be significant, but we also see verbal echoes which hint at a more specific connection. Both addressees must wrestle for control of their spirit or *thumos* (σε θυμὸς ἰθύει, Archil. fr. 196a.3; τρέψας ἀεσίφρονα θυμὸν, *WD* 646): in Archilochus' case, the speaker is unable to control his *thumos*, while in Hesiod, Perses is imagined as managing to guide his *thumos* to escape disaster. An important role is played by desire (ἵμερος), which in the Archilochean passage is used to pique the man's interest in the other girl, and is attributed to Perses at 618. The Archilochean girl tells the man to 'abstain' from sex completely: πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος (1). Using the verb to refer to sexual abstention is attested but is not common.[23] In the Hesiodic passage, the verb is used of the sea winds, since Perses is told that he will only make a profit 'if the winds *hold back* their wicked blasts' (εἴ κ' ἄνεμοί γε κακὰς ἀπέχωσιν ἀήτας, 645). The verbal connection between storm and sexual lust is suggestive, since stormy winds are often used as a metaphor for erotic desire in Greek thought, and Archilochus explores this trope extensively in the second Cologne Epode (fr. 188).[24] It would therefore make sense for Archilochus to draw on a famous didactic passage about how to avoid being overcome by storm

[23] For sexual abstention, *Il.* 14.206 = 14.305; for other usages, see *Il.* 8.35, 466, 11.799, 14.206, 16.41.

[24] For discussion see Medaglia (1977), Bonanno (1980–2), Brown (1995).

winds when composing a speech giving advice on how not to be overcome by sexual desire.

By setting up the girl's speech as a mock-Hesiodic lesson, Archilochus wryly undermines a conventional didactic trope, whereby an older and more experienced speaker offers advice to someone younger. Hesiod's use of a wastrel brother as addressee in *Works and Days* is itself a Greek variation of this trope as we know it from the Near Eastern tradition, where the advice is more commonly offered inter-generationally,[25] and it is conventional in Greek poetry for a responsible brother to offer advice to a wayward sibling, as exemplified by various brother-pairs in the *Iliad*.[26] In the Archilochus poem, however, the speaker is a teenage girl, a person of minimal authority or agency, who not only goes against the conventions of feminine silence and submissiveness by offering advice to an older unrelated male, but does so on a subject about which she ought to have no knowledge: how to control or divert sexual lust. By presenting the girl as though she were a didactic narrator, the poet subtly undermines her self-presentation as a sheltered and innocent maiden. The advice that she offers is far from conventional, as the punchline of her speech turns out to be a suggestion that she can provide a substitute girl who is willing to have immediate sex, and whose charms she advertises in enthusiastic detail. If we imagine that the lost opening of the girl's speech probably began by rejecting the man's advances on the grounds of modesty, this shift from chaste maiden to pimp undermines her stance and reveals the poem's invective subtext. Simultaneously, the audience is invited to laugh at the male who must be schooled on how to manage his sexual urges by a *parthenos*. Since in Greek thought it was women who were believed to lack self-control, the man is feminised by the girl's attempts to advise him in such matters.

As the poem continues, we see further Hesiodic allusion in the man's reply. He rejects the surrogate, now revealed to be Neoboule, and disparages her looks and character, insisting that he prefers the present girl (26–41):

αἰαῖ πέπειρα δ̣ὶ̣ς̣ ι̣τόση,
ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήιον
κ]α̣ὶ χάρις ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆν·
κόρον γὰρ οὐ̣κ̣[
(30) ἄτ]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλι̣ς̣ γ̣υνή·

[25] See Walcot 1966: 105; West 1978: 33–4; Canevaro 2017: 176–9.
[26] For detailed discussion see Swift 2018.

ἐς] κόρακας ἄπεχε·
μὴ τοῦτ᾽ ἐφ.ι̣τ᾽ ᾳ̣ν̣[
ὅ]π̣ως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ι̣αύτην ἔχων
γεί]τοσι χάρμ᾽ ἔσομαι·
πολλὸν σὲ βούλ̣ο̣[μαι πάρος·
σὺ] μὲν γὰρ οὔτ᾽ ἄπιστος οὔτε διπλ̣ό̣η,
ἡ δ]ἐ̣ μάλ᾽ ὀξυτέρη,
πολλοὺς δὲ ποιεῖτα[ι φίλους·
δέ]δ̣οιχ᾽ ὅπως μὴ τυφλὰ κἀλιτήμερα
σπ]ο̣υδῆι ἐπειγόμενος (40)
τὼς ὥσπερ ἡ κ[ύων τέκω.

Goodness, she's overripe, twice your age; her maidenly flower has dropped off, and the charm she had before. She couldn't get enough (?) . . . that crazed woman has shown the measure of her (folly). To hell with her! (Let no one ask this)? . . . that I should have a woman like that and be a laughing-stock to my neighbours. I much prefer you: you are not unreliable or two-faced, but she is painful and makes many (men her friends). I am afraid lest, pressing on in haste (I may beget) blind and premature offspring like the bitch.

The language is close to the passage in *Works and Days* on choosing a good wife (695–705):

Ὡραῖος δὲ γυναῖκα τεὸν ποτὶ οἶκον ἄγεσθαι,
μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πόλλ᾽ ἀπολείπων
μήτ᾽ ἐπιθεὶς μάλα πολλά· γάμος δέ τοι ὥριος οὗτος·
ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ᾽ ἡβώοι, πέμπτωι δὲ γαμοῖτο.
παρθενικὴν δὲ γαμεῖν, ὥς κ᾽ ἤθεα κεδνὰ διδάξηις,
τὴν δὲ μάλιστα γαμεῖν, ἥτις σέθεν ἐγγύθι ναίει 700
πάντα μάλ᾽ ἀμφὶς ἰδών, μὴ γείτοσι χάρματα γήμηις.
οὐ μὲν γάρ τι γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ λῆίζετ᾽ ἄμεινον
τῆς ἀγαθῆς, τῆς δ᾽ αὖτε κακῆς οὐ ῥίγιον ἄλλο,
δειπνολόχης, ἥ τ᾽ ἄνδρα καὶ ἴφθιμόν περ ἐόντα
εὖει ἄτερ δαλοῖο καὶ ὠμῶι γήραϊ δῶκεν.

Bring a wife to your home when you are in good season, neither falling short by very much or adding very much to thirty years. This is a marriage at the right season for you. As for the woman, she should be four years past her puberty, and in the fifth let her marry. Marry a virgin, so that you can teach her cherished customs, and most of all, marry someone who lives near you, after you have looked carefully in all directions, in case your marriage should be a source of fun to your neighbours. There is nothing better for a man to acquire than a good

> wife, but nothing more chilling than a bad one, a dinner-stealer, a woman
> who burns her husband without a torch, even though he is strong,
> and hands him over to a raw old age.

The closest parallel is the reference to the delight of neighbours, where the same wording appears in both poems (γείτοσι χάρματα, *WD*; γεί]τοσι χάρμ', Archil.). The apparent echo has been much discussed, and scholars disagree as to whether this can be considered an intertext with Hesiod, or whether both poets refer to a conventional belief or *gnōmē*.[27] An underlying *gnōmē* that sexual or marital relationships affect the wider community is attested by Odysseus' comment to Nausicaa that a marriage founded in *homophrosynē* (like-mindedness) brings joy to the couple's friends and sorrow to their enemies (*Od.* 6.184–5), but the Hesiodic adaptation of this motif is more cynical, since it assumes competition with one's neighbours; in an invective poem about sexual wrongdoing within a community, it makes sense for Archilochus to follow the Hesiodic line.[28] In terms of the man's rhetorical strategy, a reference to a poetic passage felt to express normative views on how to choose the best wife would be effective, since it would strengthen the hints that he chooses the girl over Neoboule because he is interested in a long-term relationship, not mere gratification. Taken in isolation, the verbal resonance would be insufficient evidence for a direct relationship, but the case becomes stronger when we consider it as part of a cluster of Hesiodic references around the theme of sexuality and misogynistic poetry.[29]

The central question posed in the Cologne Epode is how to establish a sexual relationship: whether sex or marriage should be prioritised, and whether one can be offered without the other. The poem retains ambiguity over exactly what the man suggests and promises, and what ensues, and the audience is left to ponder whether he and the girl fully understand each other or are speaking at cross-purposes. The crux of the man's speech is his statement that 'there are many pleasures of the goddess for young men besides the divine thing' (τ]έρψιές εἰσι θεῆς | πολλαὶ νέοισιν ἀνδ[ράσιν |

[27] For a sceptical view, see Hunter 2014: 159–60. On the laughter of neighbours see Halliwell (2008) 31.

[28] Cf. also Sem. fr. 7.110–11, where the neighbours take joy in how the husband of the bad woman is deceived by her wickedness. This is a less close verbal resonance with Hesiod than Archilochus, but in a context of low or everyday poetry and misogynistic abuse (see Koning 2010: 142–3 on these lines).

[29] Koning 2010: 140–4 argues that Hesiod's status as the canonical poet of misogyny led to him being referenced in early texts on similar themes, and discusses this passage in detail, along with Sem. fr. 7.110–11.

παρὲξ τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα, 13–15). Scholars have long debated whether 'the divine thing' refers to sex or to marriage, either of which could be considered the ultimate sexual goal, and which, the poem's humour suggests, a young man and a maiden may interpret quite differently.[30] The man clearly aims for some form of immediate sexual release, as is expressed in his euphemistic request to 'steer my course for the grassy gardens' (σχήσω γὰρ ἐς πο̣η[φόρους | κ]ή̣πους, 23–4), a metaphor whose exact meaning is deliberately unclear, but evokes the nexus of imagery of fertility and growth surrounding virginity and female sexuality.[31] He never directly offers marriage, but several times hints that a longer-term relationship may be possible, suggesting that if the girl accedes to his request, 'you and I will discuss these things at leisure, with the god's help, when (it?) gets dark' (τ]αῦτα δ' ἐπ' ἡσυχίης | εὖτ' ἂν μελανθη[| ἐ]γώ τε καὶ σὺ σὺν θεῶι βουλεύσομεν̣, 16–18). The poem ends with a startling image of ejaculation, combined with ambiguity about exactly what sex act is being described, and so leaves the audience to ponder for themselves whether the man has persuaded or tricked the girl, or has acceded to her desire to avoid full sex. A reference to a normative text on choosing a good wife would therefore fit the speaker's rhetorical strategy in hinting that a long-term relationship may be a possibility. Yet if (as is likely) the poem describes Archilochus' seduction of the younger Lycambid, the audience would also know that any hints of marriage are not made in good faith, and that in promising and then denying marriage, the male speaker achieves vengeance for his own thwarted marital hopes.[32] In this context, a statement evoking the poet most strongly associated with the misogynistic tradition would be highly appropriate.

A further reason to see Hesiod, rather than a general *gnōmē*, behind the reference to mocking neighbours is the relevance of the details involved in the Hesiodic advice. Hesiod sets up a dichotomy between the good wife, who merits praise, and the bad wife, who brings about misery. This dichotomy is echoed by Archilochus, who uses it to denigrate Neoboule

[30] Scholars have tended to argue confidently for one interpretation being 'correct', e.g. sex: Degani (1975), (1990), Nicolosi (2007); marriage: Snell *apud* Merkelbach and West (1974), Koenen (1974), but the point is that the man could mean either, and hence the girl may be beguiled into thinking he is promising more than is stated: cf. van Sickle 1975: 136–7, Morrone 1976, Swift 2019: 372–3.

[31] For discussion, see Swift 2016, 2019: 375. For detailed discussion of the metaphors, see e.g. Slings 1975, Mayer 2006, Nicolosi 2007: 201–3.

[32] The identity of the girl was suggested by the original editors of the poem (Merkelbach and West 1974) and although some scholars have challenged it (e.g. Lefkowitz 1976, Eckerman 2011) it remains the most likely scenario and is widely accepted.

and flatter the younger girl in contrast. Hesiod's addressee is also advised to marry a virgin in her fifth year after puberty, and someone whose character is well known. By contrast, the Archilochean speaker can justify his rejection of Neoboule on the grounds that she is too old: her maidenly flower has fallen away (ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήιον, 27). She is moreover no virgin, but someone who 'makes many men her friends' (πολλοὺς δὲ ποιεῖτα[ι φίλους, 38). Hesiod's most forceful piece of advice (μάλιστα, 700) relates to knowing the character of one's bride-to-be: hence a man should marry within his neighbourhood and after careful research (700–1). By contrast, Neobule is indeed nearby (she belongs to the same community) but does not keep her repugnant character hidden such that it requires a prospective suitor to 'look carefully in all directions' (cf. *WD* 701). Instead it is manifest: she is a 'crazed' woman who has 'shown the measure of her folly' (ἄτ]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλιȷ̣ς γυνή, 30). Hesiod's bad woman is paradoxically cold (ῥίγιον, 703) yet also able to burn, while Neoboule is ὀξυτέρη (37), best understood as 'painful' or 'fiery', a striking word choice which conveys a similar idea of the sharp pain inflicted on the man who will marry her.[33] Thus the Cologne Epode can be fruitfully read not merely as an engagement with standard tropes of misogynistic poetry but as a sardonic intertext with Hesiodic wisdom on choosing a marriage partner: the intertexts deepen the invective elements of the poem, as well as enriching our understanding of the narrator's persuasive strategy.

Hesiod and Misogyny II: Pandora the Beautiful

The Lycambid cycle is central to Archilochus' poetics, and thus we might expect to see engagement with Hesiod as a model for misogyny elsewhere in the poetry. The Cologne Epode provides a rare example of a substantial poem, allowing us to track intertexts across it, and offering scope to evaluate how these develop as the narrative continues. Yet a close enough verbal parallel can make it possible to argue for an intertext on the basis of much less information. An example here is fr. 195, a single line quoted without context as an example of Archilochean epodic metre:

φαινόμενον κακὸν οἴκαδ' ἄγεσθαι

To bring home a manifest evil

[33] On ὀξυτέρη, cf. Thgn. 366, Soph. *OC* 1190, and for the interpretation here see Merkelbach and West 1974; Swift 2019: 378.

This is a dactylic tetrameter and most likely the second line of a poem, since we know that a hexameter followed by a tetrameter was an Archilochean combination, and that Hephaestion usually quotes the earliest example of the line in the poem he uses.[34] The conjunction of ἄγεσθαι and οἴκαδε often indicates the marriage procession, and therefore the idea of bringing home an evil would refer to the trope that a bad wife is a bane to men.[35] The metre of this fragment may be shared with a papyrus published in the 1950s but reclassified as Archilochean in 2012, and this too appears to come from a poem dealing with an unfortunate marriage.[36] Though very fragmentary, the papyrus preserves marginal comments which include a reference to a husband who was 'not chosen for you by lot' (οὐ]κ ἀποκληρωθήσε̣τ'(αί) σοι ὁ ἀνὴρ, 20), mention of virginity and marriage (π]αρθενείας αὐτὴν γημαν̣'τ', 20), and a description of a girl as having a bad character (κακὴ ὑπάρχουσα, 24). If the papyrus can with reasonable confidence be ascribed to the same poem, the case that this is an invective poem directed at a girl and her foolish new husband is strengthened still further.

While the idea that men suffer from a bad marriage is not limited to one author, its expression as a poetic trope appears even in the archaic period to have been most closely linked to Hesiod (as discussed above). Moreover, an examination of fr. 195 reveals a closer relationship than the evocation of a general trope, for the wording resembles the description of Pandora in the *Theogony* (585–6):

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε καλὸν κακὸν ἀντ' ἀγαθοῖο,
> ἐξάγαγ' ἔνθά περ ἄλλοι ἔσαν θεοὶ ἠδ' ἄνθρωποι
>
> When he had devised that beautiful evil in exchange for that good thing, he led her out to where the other gods and the humans were.

The idea that beauty can deceive a man is no doubt traditional;[37] Hesiod was probably not the first or only poet to treat the Pandora myth. Nevertheless, Archilochus here seems to engage in wordplay with a

[34] For the metre (which is used by Horace in *Odes* 1.7), see *GL* i.520.15.

[35] ἄγεσθαι + οἴκαδε: e.g. *Il.* 3.404, Hes. *WD* 695, 800, and see West 1978 on *WD* 695, Headlam and Knox 1922 on Her. 5.70.

[36] See Ucciardello 2012: the papyrus is included among the *dubia* as Archil. fr. 313a in Swift 2019. The metre of the shorter line is uncertain as no complete lines survive, but dactylic tetrameter is the most likely option. Archilochus rarely reuses epodic metres (though there seem to be counter-examples to this 'rule'), so the existence of two fragments which deal with the same theme would make it plausible that they come from the same poem.

[37] Another obvious mythological example is of course Helen, who is both beautiful and destructive, and whose marriage causes the downfall of an entire community. The anonymous

particular verbal formulation, rather than merely referring to a well-known legend. If Pandora was an attractive evil (καλὸν), the woman in his poem falls short even on this point, since her evil is obvious (φαινόμενον) rather than hidden behind a beautiful façade. While Epimetheus may have made a mistake, it is understandable why he should have been tricked by Pandora's charms, and he thus represents an 'everyman' figure, at the mercy of female deceptiveness. Conversely, anyone who marries the Archilochean woman is simply a fool, and both he and the girl are legitimate targets of mockery.

The Justice of Beasts

Our final case study comes from Archilochus' most celebrated poem in antiquity: the epode in which he narrated the fable of the fox and the eagle as a warning to Lycambes. Though the poem survives only in several short fragments, the Aesopic tradition (1 Perry) enables us to reconstruct the narrative. The fable tells of a fox and eagle who made a vow of friendship, but one day the eagle carried off the fox's young as food for his chicks. The fox, in deep distress, cursed the eagle. Shortly afterwards, the eagle took a piece of burning sacrificial meat from an altar and brought it back to his nest: the meat contained a spark which set fire to the nest and destroyed the unfledged chicks. Archilochus tells this story to explain his invective against Lycambes, and the poem opens with an attack on his wits and character, before introducing the fable to expand on the immorality of breaking an oath of friendship. At the heart of the poem lay a speech given by the fox, whose purpose is to establish the audience's sympathy for her cause (and by implication, the poet's, who also casts himself as wronged and betrayed). She prays to Zeus for vengeance, using high-flown and traditional language (fr. 177):

> ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,
> σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾶις
> λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων
> ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.
>
> O Zeus, father Zeus, yours is the power in heaven, you see both the wicked and the lawful deeds of men, and the violence and justice of beasts is your concern.

reviewer suggests a parallel with *Il.* 3.404, where Helen describes Menelaus as wishing to 'lead hateful me home' (στυγερὴν ἐμὲ οἴκαδ' ἄγεσθαι).

The fox takes the traditional concept that the world is divided into three orders: gods, men, and beasts. The repetition σὸν μέν (1) . . . σὺ δ' (2) . . . σοὶ δέ (3) introduces each level and confirms Zeus' authority over it. Yet though the levels are presented in descending order, with men occupying a midway position between gods and animals, the animal world is just as capable of morality (ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη, 4) and is described in terms which mirror the behaviour of humans (λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, 3). The attribution of justice to animals is almost unique in archaic Greek thought: it inverts the traditional belief that humans are unique in their moral capacity.[38] The underlying premise of the standard animal fable is that stories set in the animal kingdom can mirror human ethical situations, but it does not make this point explicitly. Indeed, bringing human morality or the relative status of men and beasts into the frame of an animal fable is jarring, since it invites the listener to confront the suspension of disbelief needed to engage with the animals' anthropomorphic behaviour. What Archilochus is doing here is less startling if we take it in conjunction with *Works and Days*, a poem which also uses the traditional medium of animal fable to investigate the same question. While the fox's speech is perfectly comprehensible without a knowledge of Hesiod, an audience member aware of the Hesiodic *ainos* would be in a much stronger position to interpret it, and to relate the Hesiodic message to Archilochus' threat to Lycambes.

Hesiod's own exploration of animal morality is found in his telling of the *ainos* of the hawk and the nightingale (202–12). This is a sophisticated passage that itself has often been read as intertextual (with epic or other Hesiodic passages), where the audience is required to think outside the immediate framing of the *ainos* in order to make sense of it.[39] Hesiod tells the story of a rapacious hawk who seizes a gentle nightingale, and when she weeps, reminds her of his superior force and warns her that her life is in his power. The story is couched as a 'fable for the kings who themselves have understanding' (αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν ἐρέω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς, 202). It seems to conclude with the moral that might is right, but it is followed immediately by the injunction to Perses to 'heed justice' (ἄκουε δίκης, 213), and a little later Hesiod undercuts the triumphalism of the hawk's message in an address to Perses (274–80):[40]

[38] See Gagarin 1974: 190, Renehan 1981: 154–6.

[39] For readings of the *ainos* as an intertext with epic, see e.g. Steiner 2007, 2012. It has also been seen as referring to the ethics of the *Theogony*, e.g. Nelson 1997, Mordine 2006.

[40] On the structural parallels that help the audience understand that the apparent moral of the fable is corrected by the later parable of *Dike*, see Pucci 1977: 65–6, Bonnafé 1983.

ἼΩ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσι
καί νυ δίκης ἐπάκουε, βίης δ' ἐπιλήθεο πάμπαν.
τόνδε γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων,
ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηρσὶ καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεηνοῖς
ἔσθειν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ' αὐτοῖς·
ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἔδωκε δίκην, ἣ πολλὸν ἀρίστη
γίνεται·

Perses, lay these things in your heart and pay attention to justice, and put violence from your mind altogether. For this is the law that Zeus has established for mankind: fish and beasts and winged birds eat each other, since there is no justice among them, but to mankind he has given justice, which is by far the best.

Hesiod, then, undermines the traditional use of the animal fable, by highlighting the moral differences between humans and animals. The purpose of an animal fable is to shed light on human morality, but the behaviour of the hawk offers no meaningful template for the listener, since the rules of *dikē* do not apply within the animal kingdom. Any of the kings who have understood the fable as an endorsement of their authority discover the sting in the tail that by behaving like the hawk they deny their humanity and their elevated status within Zeus' dominion.[41] Hesiod calls into question the traditional purpose of the animal fable – to tell a story about human morality through the lens of animals – by suggesting that what we can learn from animals is only how differently from them we should behave.

By contrast, Archilochus approaches this question from the opposite perspective, by having his fox deny any difference between humans and animals, and so reject the premise that humans enjoy a special place in the moral order.[42] This undermining of Hesiod's stance is signalled by the beginning of the fable narrative, where the poet announces that he will tell an αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων (fr. 174), a phrase which would most naturally be understood as subjective genitive (i.e. 'a fable told by men') but could also be taken as an objective genitive ('a fable about men').[43] The latter interpretation would act as a reminder that it is really human behaviour which is under examination, and collapses the sense of the animal fable as providing a distanced space in which to explore moral issues. Archilochus' fox prays to Zeus, and her claim that he acts as guardian of *dikē* among the beasts is confirmed by the narrative, since the eagle's nest is

[41] On the negative attitude to kings implicit in *WD*, see Canevaro 2017: 175.
[42] See Irwin 1998: 181–2; Steiner 2012: 16. [43] See Corrêa 2007: 103–4.

set alight by a spark from a piece of sacrificial meat (fr. 180). Both Archilochus and Hesiod choose a story where the action is precipitated by animals eating one another, an ordinary feature of the natural world which becomes abhorrent when animals are presented as behaving like humans. This is heightened in both poems by the use of the term δεῖπνον, usually associated with human dining (*WD* 209, Archil. fr. 179). Thus we can see Archilochus' poem as a rebuttal of Hesiod's coda: whereas Hesiod challenges the logic of the animal fable as a moralising tactic by highlighting the differences between men and beasts, Archilochus instead extends this logic to its natural conclusion, presenting a fully anthromorphised world in which man has lost his special status and where Zeus takes as great an interest in the justice of beasts as that of men. By competing with Hesiod, Archilochus bolsters his own authority as a wisdom-poet, and so strengthens his poem's main objective: cast himself as the wronged party and guardian of moral rectitude, and so destroy his victim's reputation.

Conclusion

An analysis of Archilochus' moralising strategies demonstrates beyond doubt that he and his audience were steeped in the wider didactic tradition. The poet can echo, adapt, and parody typical tropes associated with the genre, and for these techniques to be effective, he must have expected his audience to recognise the references and appreciate how they are being manipulated to fit the iambic world. This in itself is no surprise, since didactic literature must have flourished across the archaic Greek world (as it did beyond and before it), and Archilochus shows himself to be a poet who is interested in creative reimagination of other forms.

Yet Archilochus' richest surviving engagements with the didactic tradition also suggest that there is a case to be made in support of a direct engagement not merely with shared tropes, but with specific instantiations. We find cases that seem to be allusions to the high points of the Hesiodic poems: the hawk and nightingale *ainos*, the Nautilia, the myth of Pandora, and advice about marriage. These are memorable moments in the poems, and self-contained passages that could potentially have circulated and been performed independently from (or alongside) full performances of the whole texts. While the state of our evidence makes it impossible to prove such a connection definitively (a sceptic can always refer an apparent intertext, however convincing, to a hypothetical shared trope on the same topic), the depth of apparent intertexts in the individual passages,

combined with their cumulative effect, means that the balance of probabilities points the other way.

What is for us a problem (the difficulty of determining whether an allusion is to a shared pool or a specific instantiation) can also be understood as an opportunity for the poets and their audiences. We should not assume a fixed level of expertise among audience members, and even if we assumed Archilochus' primary audience was an elite sympotic group, there must have been *hetairoi* who were better versed in the wider poetic tradition, and others who were relatively inexperienced. These audience members could engage to different degrees with Archilochus' poetry depending on whether they recognise a passage as evoking a trope with which they are familiar, or whether they are able to identify a reference to a famous instantiation. The poems are nevertheless still effective and engaging for those who achieve neither, since the allusions are subtle enough not to create a sense of exclusion for those who do not recognise them. The strategy is similar to what we see in the Athenian dramatists, where poets have an incentive to engage and flatter the most educated and experienced audience members but must avoid alienating the others. Archilochus' engagement with Hesiodic tropes certainly attests to the rich tradition from which both Hesiod's and Archilochus' didactic poetry emerges, and the audience's competence to recognize the manipulation of its conventions. Yet if we accept these allusions as specifically Hesiodic, this must have consequences for our assumptions about the process of canonisation in the Greek world, and the literary landscape in which poets were operating.